



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,158	12/18/2000	Hiroyuki Kawakami	4303-10	9843

7590 03/09/2004

LAFF, WHITESEL & SARET, LTD
401 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/739,158

Applicant(s)

KAWAKAMI, HIROYUKI

Examiner

Mohammad A Siddiqi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-39 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohaban et al. (6,463,470) (hereinafter Mohaban).
4. As per claim 1, Mohaban discloses a computer readable recording medium (col 1, lines 20-25), wherein an IP (Internet Protocol) (Col 9, lines 30-31) network service oriented DIT (Directory Information Tree) construction (col 19, lines 54-66) including a customer (col 19, lines 1-9, users are customers) and a policy sub-tree is recorded (col 23, lines 35-45), said recording medium including mapping (fig 1, element 608, col 10, lines

35-36) established between said customer tree (col 19, lines 1-9, users are customers) and said policy sub-tree (col 23, lines 35-45).

Mohaban Does not explicitly teach the limitation "Customer sub-tree".

Mohaban does teach creating sub-tree (col 18), LDAP (col 10, lines 50-67), containment hierarchy (col 18, lines 62-67) branch and leaves (col 19, 1-9)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention is made to modify Mohaban's teaching by specifying customer branch, leaves, hierarchy, LDAP as a s sub-tree. Since the same functionality of creating customer sub-trees can be achieved.

5. As per claim 2, Mohaban discloses wherein said IP network (Col 9, lines 30-31) oriented DIT construction (col 19, lines 54-66) sub-tree further has network sub-trees (col 6, lines 35-47).

6. As per claim 3, Mohaban discloses a computer readable recording medium, wherein an IP (Internet Protocol) network (Col 9, lines 30-31) service oriented DIT (Directory Information Tree) construction (col 19, lines 54-66) Including a customer and a policy sub-tree is recorded (col 23, lines 35-45, and col 18), comprising:

plural service entries (col 17, lines 5-10) dangling (col 28, line 65, and col 16, lines 52-58) below (col 27, lines 45-47) said customer (col 19, lines 1-9, users are customers);

plural policy rule entries (col 6, lines 4-12) dangling (col 28, line 65, and col 16, lines 52-58) below each of said service entries (col 17, lines 5-10);

plural policy rule (col 6, lines 4-12) format entries dangling (col 28, line 65, and col 16, lines 52-58) below said policy sub-tree (col 6, lines 4-11); and

plural service class definition (col 14, lines 5-10) entry dangling (col 28, line 65, and col 16, lines 52-58) below said system sub-tree;

each of said plural service entries (col 17, lines 5-10) including as an attribute a condition parameter (col 6, lines 44-47 and col 21, lines 10-36) which is referred to from each policy rule entry via each policy rule format entry 9col 6, lines 36-47);

each of said plural service entries (col 17, lines 5-10) Including as an attribute an action parameter (col 6, lines 44-47) which is referred to from each policy rule entry via each policy rule format entry and via each service class definition entry (col 14, lines 5-10).

Mohaban Does not explicitly teach the limitation "Customer sub-tree".

Mohaban does teach creating sub-tree (col 18), LDAP (col 10, lines 50-67), containment hierarchy (col 18, lines 62-67) branch and leaves (col 19, 1-9)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention is made to modify Mohaban's teaching by specifying customer branch, leaves, hierarchy, LDAP as a s sub-tree. Since the same functionality of creating customer sub-trees can be achieved.

7. As per claim 4, Mohaban discloses each of said plural service entries further includes as an attribute (col 17, lines 10-17) a service type specifying a band and a packet transfer priority (col 14, lines 20-47), said service type being the name of a specific one of said service a class definition entries (col 14, lines 55-64).

8. As per claims 5 and 12, Mohaban discloses each of said plural service entries further includes as an attribute a rule creation state Indicating whether or not a policy rule Entry is created below each service entry Itself (col 18).

9. As per claims 6, 13, and 19, Mohaban discloses each of said plural service entries further includes as an attribute a provisioning date/

unprovisioning date which controls a policy setting/releasing operation from a policy management system (col 3, lines 40-48, in general, provisioning means "providing". In telecommunications terminology, provisioning means providing a product or service, such as wiring or bandwidth).

10. As per claim 7, 14,20, and 25 Mohaban discloses each of said plural service entries further includes as an attribute (col 21, lines 10-35) a network element acquired when a policy rule entry below each service entry is set (fig 8A, col 6, lines 4-12).

11. As per claims 8,15, 21,26, and 30, Mohaban discloses each of said plural service class definition entries further includes as an attribute a parameter representing a feature of a service corresponding to a service type and a pointer (col 26, lines 30-32) to a policy rule format entry to be applied to said service (col 6, lines 24-35).

12. As per claims 9,16,22, 27,31, and 34, Mohaban discloses each of said plural policy rule format entries further includes as an attribute a condition parameter and an action parameter, each to be possessed by a policy rule, and a network element to which said policy rule is applied (col 6, lines 44-47).

13. As per claims 10,17,23,28, 32,35, and 37, Mohaban discloses each of said plural policy rule entries further includes as an attribute a pointer to a corresponding policy rule format entry (col 26, lines 30-32), a rule state indicating whether or not said policy rule has been applied to a network element (col 7, lines 61-67), and a target network element specifying a network element to which said policy rule is applied (col 24, lines 63-67).

14. As per claims 11,18,24, 29,33,36,38, and 39, Mohaban discloses said IP network (col 9, lines 30-31) oriented DIT construction sub-tree (col 19, lines 54-66) further has network sub-trees (col 7, lines 1-15).

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,122,258 to Brown et al.

U.S. Patent 6,038,563 to Bapat et al.

U.S. Patent 6,052,681 to Harvey et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose

telephone number is (703) 305-0353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100